



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/295,718	04/21/1999	STEVEN M. BLUMENAU	EO295/7087/R	7529

7590 02/10/2003

ROBERT PLOTKIN
C/O WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS PC
FEDERAL RESERVE PLAZA
600 ATLANTIC AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 022102211

EXAMINER

WILLETT, STEPHAN F

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 9

2141

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/295,718

Applicant(s)

Blumenau et al.

Examiner

Stephan Willett

Art Unit

2141



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Stephan Willett

(3) _____

(2) Richard Guinta

(4) _____

Date of Interview Feb 6, 2003Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 14

Identification of prior art discussed:

Ma and HaAgreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The representative highlighted the facts that (1) altering the manner the program accesses data, (2) comparing different configurations or access manners and (3) determining a second manner to access a program was not taught.

The examiner explained the breadth of the claim language in light of his knowledge of the art and the cited teachings and suggested a written response be provided. After the fact review with a Primary and of the Ma reference, teaches "adding a new routine require pasting in program code", col. 7, lines 10-11 that are "recompiled and re-linked", col. 7, lines 17 and see lines 41-43 and this alters the manner in which a program accesses a resource, even if done indirectly via another program. Note also one set of claims reboots while the other does not reboot or reinitialize

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required